

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Amendment

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Sheetal S. Patel (Reg. No. 59,326) on June 11, 2008.
3. The application has been amended as follows:

Please AMEND claims 12, 13 and 14 and CANCEL claim 21 in accordance with the following:

12. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A CORBA object reference generating device stored on a computer recordable medium, comprising:
a request receiving unit which receives, via a server having a server IP address, a request for Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) naming service, the request being transmitted by a first client to an arrival IP address; and
a naming service unit which generates a CORBA object reference including a reference IP address, the CORBA object reference being required for the first client to access an object;

wherein the naming service unit receives the request and connection information including the arrival IP address, determines whether the arrival IP address is a predetermined IP address, sets the server IP address as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is determined to be the predetermined IP address, and sets an IP address other than the server IP address as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is not determined to be the predetermined IP address.

13. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) The CORBA object reference generating device stored on a computer recordable medium according to claim 12, further comprising:

a system structure information control unit that controls system structure information that indicates a relationship between the predetermined IP address and the server IP address, wherein the naming service unit refers to the system structure information to make the determination and generate the CORBA object reference.

14. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A CORBA object reference generating device stored on a computer recordable medium, comprising:

a request receiving unit that receives, from a first client connected to a first network, a first request for CORBA naming service, the first request being transmitted from the first client to a first IP address corresponding to the first network, and from a second client connected to a second network, a second request for CORBA naming service, the second request being transmitted from the second client to a second IP address corresponding to the second network; and

a naming service unit that generates an object reference including a reference IP address, the object reference being required for the first or second client to access an object, wherein the naming service unit receives connection information including the first or second IP address and the first or second request for CORBA naming service, determines whether the first or second IP address is a predetermined IP address, sets an IP address for load distribution as the reference IP address if it is determined that the first or second IP address is determined to be the predetermined IP address, and sets the first or second IP address as the reference IP address if it is determined that the first or second IP address is not determined to be the predetermined IP address.

21. (CANCELLED)

Response to Arguments

4. The Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on March 5, 2008 and March 19, 2008 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. *Claims 12-20 are allowed. The claims indicated include limitations that the prior arts of record do not appear to teach or render obvious, hence they are allowed.*
6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
As presented in the previous Office Action, Glass et al. (US006629128B1) discloses, "the present invention also dynamically generates remote proxies and other objects to

provide communications across the network" (Glass, col.4, lines 43-46). In addition, Glass discloses, "*the remote proxy generator resides in the server-side object request broker and instantiates the remote proxy class to create a remote proxy object*" (Glass, col.4, lines 8-10) and that "*a system constructed using the principles outlined in this patent application dynamically generates remote proxy classes as needed at run-time*" (Glass, col.6, lines 51-54). Hence, Glass teaches of a system for distributed processing in a computer network that dynamically generates remote proxies and other objects to provide communications across the network. Glass discloses, "*The distributed object management system 16 may comprise Voyager, a distributed network communications system developed by ObjectSpace, Inc., CORBA (Common Object Request Broker Architecture), a technology for inter-object communications developed by a consortium of companies, DCOM, an inter-application communications system for networked computers developed by Microsoft, RMI, an inter-object communications system for networked computers developed by Sun Microsystems, Inc., or any other suitable distributed object management system*" (Glass, col.5, lines 47-57). Hence, Glass teaches of the distributed object management system utilizing CORBA technology.

Also presented in the previous Office Action, O'Neil et al. (US006128279A) discloses, "*The present invention addresses the foregoing needs by providing, in one aspect, a plurality of network servers which directly handle load balancing on a peer-to-peer basis. Thus, when any of the servers receives a request, the server either processes the request or routes the request to one of its peers --depending on their respective loads and/or on the contents of the request. By implementing load balancing directly on the servers, the need for dedicated load balancing hardware is reduced, as are the disadvantages resulting from such hardware. Thus, for example, because each server*

has the capability to perform load balancing, access to a Web site managed by the server is not subject to a single point of failure. Moreover, requests tagged with IP addresses cached by remote DNSs or the requestor itself are handled in the same way as other requests, i.e., by being routed among the load balancing-enabled servers” (O’Neil, col.3, lines 18-33). Hence, O’Neil teaches that when any of the servers (i.e., Applicant’s apportioning server) receiving a request, the server either processes the request (i.e., Applicant’s establishes a connection with the arrival IP address) or routes the request to one of its peer—depending on their respective loads (i.e., Applicant’s distributes a load to a server having a lightest load in comparison with other servers) and/or on the contents of the request. O’Neil discloses, “*The invention has particular utility in connection with World Wide Web servers, but can be used with other servers as well, such as CORBA servers, ORB servers, FTP servers, SMTP servers, and Java servers*” (O’Neil, col.1, lines 14-17). Hence, O’Neil teaches of the load balancing system used in a CORBA server environment.

However, the prior arts of record fail to teach or suggest individually or in combination as stated in the independent claims for “*a naming service unit which generates a CORBA object reference including a reference IP address, the CORBA object reference being required for the first client to access an object; wherein the naming service unit receives the request and connection information including the arrival IP address, determines whether the arrival IP address is a predetermined IP address, sets the server IP address as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is determined to be the predetermined IP address, and sets an IP address other than the server IP address as the reference IP address if the arrival IP address is not determined to be the predetermined IP address*” and in combination with other limitations as set forth

Art Unit: 2145

in the independent claims, as well as Applicant's arguments presented on pages 6-9 of the After Non-Final Amendment filed on March 5, 2008.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 571/272-3911. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason D. Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571/273-8300 for regular communications and 571/273-8300 for After Final communications.

/Thomas Duong/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145

June 20, 2008

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145